

ts of the Author.

ANITY
TESTED BY REASON.

BY THE

REV. R. A. HUME, M. A.,

AHMEDNAGAR.

BOMBAY TRACT AND BOOK SOCIETY.

Bombay:

PRINTED AT JAVAJI DADAJI'S "NIRNAYA-SAGAR" PRESS.

1893.

Price Half an Anna.

CHRISTIANITY TESTED BY REASON.

"We do not believe that the Bible is inspired more than other religious books; we do not believe that any religious books have any authority beyond the inherent reasonableness of any doctrines which they teach; whatever religious beliefs we accept must be such as commend themselves to our reason," so many men in India think and say. Personally we believe that, if they knew the Bible better than they do, they would appreciate it more. Nevertheless, we are ready to meet them on their own ground. It is our deepest conviction that Christ knows the head and heart of man; that the intellect and affections of man are so made as to recognize the supreme excellence of Christ, if men are willing to give a candid and earnest consideration to His teachings and offer of help; and that, fairly judged by the reason, He and His doctrines are all in the highest degree reasonable. By "reasonable" we mean the same in religion as in science, *i. e.* credible on account of sufficient evidence. There are a thousand things in the material world which our reasons *apprehend* and the truth of which we implicitly recognize in our lives, which our reasons do not fully *comprehend*. That is, much of our knowledge is partial and connected with mystery. It is both true and reasonable that the same should hold in our knowledge of spiritual things. We strenuously insist that there is not one teaching of Christ which is contrary to reason, and which, rightly understood, does not commend itself as entirely reasonable. He made His disciples by appealing to their minds and hearts to testify that He was truth and spoke truth. We propose to try to commend the Christian position to the *reason* of our readers by such a statement of it as commends it to our own reason. All we ask is a candid and earnest consideration of our statements. For every one knows that a man is disqualified to act as judge or juror, if he is biased, or if he neglects to give careful attention to all evidence that is adduced. We have no hesitation whatever in submitting the Christian position to any proper test of reason. Our only fear is that

India is now so absorbed in attention to political and other subjects that many will not give Christ and Christianity a careful consideration.

To begin with, Christianity has a threefold aspect; it is a life, a history, and a philosophy. Primarily and chiefly it is a life, a true life of Jesus Christ in the souls of individual men, making them different from what they were before He began to live in them. In the second place, Christianity is a history; it alleges that such and such events occurred at certain times. Thirdly, it is a philosophy, an interpretation of man and nature. Some persons accept historical Christianity without any grasp of it as a philosophy, or any experience of it in daily living. A few have an intelligent understanding of it as a philosophy, who do not apply it to control their lives. All persons who are true Christians have a vital experience of Christ's help from day to day, though some of them have an imperfect knowledge of it as a history, and many of them could not give a clear account of just how He helps them. With our physical life, it is of comparatively little consequence whether we understand the *history* of our food, *i. e.* what the wheat is from which our bread is made and where it grows; or the *philosophy* of our food, *i. e.* how the various constituents of the wheat are adapted to the various parts of our bodies and how they nourish these; the *vital* experience of strength from eating the bread is the great thing; this vital experience is the great proof to us that bread is good for us and for others. So it is with our spiritual life. It does not make much difference if one does not know *all* the history of Christianity or its philosophy, if only he has an experience of Christ's help in his soul. In common with multitudes of Christians we *know by experience* that Christ helps our souls. Nevertheless, if a fellowman had no experience of food which we had found helpful, and did not believe it was good for him, we would give him a statement of its philosophy, if we could, and would try to show him how it was fitted to do him good. So we are thankful to ask

our non-Christian friends to examine the philosophical reasonableness of Christ and His teachings, believing that a fair consideration of this will help them to try His aid. And, after giving a philosophical explanation about the food which we had found helpful and which we recommended to others, just as we should urge men to *try* a little of the food and see if it did not nourish them, so while showing the reasonableness of Christianity we must ask our friends to *try* Christ's help just so far as they see Him to be reasonable. For philosophy without life will nourish neither body nor soul.

In attempting to state, and by the statement to show, the reasonableness of Christianity as a philosophy, *i. e.* the truth of Christ and His teachings, we first explain that *by the term Christianity we mean only Christ and His teachings*. Things have been taught by Christians which were never taught by Christ. Our only fear is that in touching on some Christian doctrines we may ourselves unintentionally make some statements or offer some explanations which He would not have made. And in giving explanations we shall sometimes state *less* than we believe. For in this connection we intend to give only such reasons as seem to us incontrovertible. Because Christians differ among themselves on some points of the philosophy of their beliefs.

We see from the writings of early Christian philosophers, such as Origen and Clement of Alexandria, that the thinkers of Greece and Rome asked the advocates of Christianity in those times if they could commend their faith to reason. Those advocates gladly made the attempt and satisfied their inquirers, so that Christianity became *the* philosophy of the Roman empire. Similarly most of the great thinkers of modern times such as Des Cartes, Pascal, Kant, Goethe, Bacon, Newton, including even the leading scientists, such as Herschell, Brewster, Faraday, Whewell, and Sir William Thomson, have accepted Christianity as the true philosophy. We desire India earnestly to put it to the test of reason, in the firm conviction that Christ and His teachings will appear to this land also to be the highest reason.

The Man of Christianity.

Christianity being Christ and His teachings, we naturally first take up Christ. What has the reason to say about Him?

Most persons will at the very least say, "We believe that Jesus Christ was a very wise and very good man." Many add, "However, there have been other wise and teachers about religion, and we do not feel any special need of help from Christ." In this last position there is shown such an inadequate appreciation of the true character of Christ, and of man's own weakness, and so little of moral earnestness and aspiration, that it is hard to feel respect for it. When one complacently says that though Christ was doubtless a very superior being, he himself does not need any help from Christ, what shall we say! However, we start from the position of most Indians that Jesus Christ was a very wise and very good man. He is also immeasurably the most influential religious teacher in the world. In the western world there is positively no other great teacher. And this Teacher is sending His disciples all over the eastern world, to both educated and uneducated peoples, and is asking them to accept Him as their Teacher and Helper. This being so, how can a thinking man fancy that he does not need to have living relations with this Teacher?

First, Jesus Christ is *the Man* of Christianity. What has the reason to say about Him? When we try to describe Him we feel an utter inability to do so with any adequacy. We do not know and cannot conceive of any point in which He could be improved. His *intellectual* nature seems perfect. In respect to the things of which He spoke, He never shows any trace of ignorance on anything which man could know, no trace of mental effort, every thing is intuitive and perfect, no trace of one-sidedness. There are many departments of knowledge to which He never referred. But the one department in which He moved is the highest of all—the knowledge of men. He knew men perfectly. The human soul is the most intricate and wonderful mechanism on which philosophers have studied. No man ever came to Jesus without feeling, "This man knows me." Look at the facts of His life and see the way in which He always immediately read every one's character, and with perfect wisdom adapted His words and actions thereto. And up to to-day who else is there who has lived whose teachings are so correct and so profound in answering that most momentous question, "How shall I live so as to make the most of myself?" and the similar

question for mankind, "What is the true life for society?" Matthew Arnold has well said, "Try all the ways [to peace and welfare] you can think of, and you will find that no way brings you to it except the way of Jesus; but this way does bring you to it."

Jesus' *emotional* nature was perfect. His whole soul was in everything that He said and did. He was not only full of sympathy and love, under perfect control. *He was love.*

Other men belong to some age and country and race. Jesus is the one perfect man who belongs alike to every age and land and race.

* "He was a Jew, but he is in no sense Jewish. The Jewish character has been sordid and worldly from the time of bargaining Jacob to the present day; there was no sign of the sordid and selfish in Jesus of Nazareth. It has been narrow and exclusive; no character in history so catholic as Jesus of Nazareth. In its highest phases it has been Pharasaic, ruled by a conscience always exacting and generally ceremonial; no life so free, so joyous, so regardless of what I may call the mere etiquette of religion as that of Jesus of Nazareth. In these three great characteristics of Hebrew character he is the antipode of his race, yet in neither re-acting against them. . . . He is as free from asceticism as from worldliness, from a sentimental philanthropism as from a narrow dogmatism; and from license as from bondage to the law. . . . He is not Jewish, nor anti-Jewish, but human. . . . There is no other character in history which is thus accepted as the ideal of manhood and the disclosure of Godhood by men of all races, nationalities, creeds and rituals.

"What is more inexplicable is the fact that he, who transcends all distinctions of race, transcends also the universal distinction of sex, and is accepted alike by the most refined and delicate women and the most heroic men as their ideal.

"Transcending all distinctions of individual idiosyncrasy, of race and nationality, and even of sex, the character of Christ transcends also all the progress of the ages. He still marches at the head of humanity; and the world, after eighteen centuries, has much to learn before it has learned him, and much to do before it has become him. The influence of most men dies with them; if in some few instances it survives, it grows less as the years pass on. First a power, then an influ-

ence, then only a memory: of whom is not this true, if we except Jesus of Nazareth? In his case the reverse is true. He died in darkness amid scorn and contumely. . . . To-day his name fills the world; . . . and the last eighty years of the Church's life sees a greater accession to his followers, than the total growth of all the eighteen hundred years which preceded.

"Says John Stuart Mill, 'Whatever else may be taken away from us by rational criticism, Christ is still left; a unique figure, not more unlike all his precursors than all his followers, even those who had the direct benefit of his teaching. It is of no use to say that Christ as exhibited in the Gospels is not historical, and that we know not how much of what is admirable has been supplemented by the tradition of his followers. . . . Who among his disciples, or among their proselytes was capable of inventing the sayings ascribed to Jesus, or of imagining the life and character revealed in the Gospels? . . . Nor would it be easy, even for an unbeliever to find a better translation of the rule of virtue from the abstract into the concrete than to endeavor so to live that Christ would approve our life!'"

Christianity is Jesus Christ and what He taught and does. Is it not most reasonable to accept Him as the ideal man, and then to believe and to follow His teachings? That is what His first disciples did. So the way of *life* is the only way even now to know Jesus and to become like Him. Whoever will follow the life of Christ and try to model himself after the character of Christ will be best able to understand Him. And is it unreasonable for those who thus come into vital relations with Him and who cannot account for Him on other grounds to accept Him as more than man? How was it possible for a man of a narrow-minded race, without any educational or other advantages, to become the one perfect man of all ages, nations, and races, if He were only a man? Is a man honest *intellectually* if he neglects to weigh this important problem, and superficially pushes Jesus one side as one about whom he need take little thought? Is a man honest *spiritually* if he thinks and says that he has no need of help from such a being as Jesus, and simply is satisfied with admitting that He was very wise and good? Does he use even his reason aright when he takes such an attitude toward Jesus? We have no hesita-

* See Abbott's *In Aid of Faith*.

tion in affirming that in Jesus Christ Christianity, tested by reason, supplies an ideal *Man* who should be studied, loved, and imitated.

The God of Christianity.

We have shown that Christianity is in the highest degree reasonable in its ideal *man*. Let us now see whether the God of Christianity is One who meets the highest test of reason. The Christian's God is the God whom Jesus Christ knows and reveals. The first thing which Christ teaches us about God is that He is Light, *i. e.*, one whose nature is to reveal himself. There are three ways in which the Christian's God reveals Himself—in nature, in man, and in Jesus Christ. To a certain extent in all religions it is taught that God is manifested in nature and that he is an Infinite Power. But all that most religions say is that nature gives assurance that there *is* a God and gives warrant for the belief about Him that He is almighty, wise, and good: nature does not give a *vital acquaintance with Him*. Indeed it is impossible for physical things, uninterpreted, to express spiritual life. But with such an interpreter as Christ all nature is in some way a revelation of God as a personal Spirit of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness.

In man there is a much fuller revelation of God than in physical nature and in the brute creation. Thinking men readily admit this, and every man's consciousness is evidence of it. Jesus Christ constantly assumed that from their own natures men could know a good deal of God. It was on this assumption that He based His parables and made His appeals. Thus He said, "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?" That is, Jesus Christ teaches that from everything which is good in our own nature we may understand what God is in an infinite degree.

These best impulses of our hearts teach every man something of God. But at best how imperfect a knowledge they give us. God's revelation of Himself is progressive. First, revealing Himself in the physical world, He expressed His thoughts by the evolution of successively higher and higher stages of

existence. Then, when He had made the world fit for the habitation of man, He created man, a spiritual being, whom He made, according to Biblical language, "in His own image;" and therefore it is that from man's intellectual and moral nature we can know something of God. But even the best man knows that he is a very imperfect image of God, and in mankind sin has sadly marred that image. It is reasonable to suppose that even if man had never sinned, according to His progressive method of revealing Himself, God would have made some fuller revelation of Himself than He gives in ordinary men. And the awful, universal fact that sin has marred this revelation makes it seem even to reason most urgent and probable that God would give some fuller revelation of Himself. Is it not reasonable that, when man did not know,—as the history of mankind shows—how to escape from sin and its consequences, God would reveal Himself as a Redeemer? It would be *unreasonable* to believe that a good God would not so reveal Himself.

Now it is a simple historical fact that when Jesus Christ came into the world, He did give a fuller revelation of God than men had ever had before. He certainly *claimed* to be such a revelation of God that by knowing Him men would know God. Thus at one time one of his disciples said to Him, "Lord, show us the Father and it sufficeth us." He replied, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?" At another time He said to the multitude, "He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me. And he that seeth me, seeth Him that sent me" [*i. e.* God].

Jesus believed Himself to be, and taught that He was the revealer of God. We would rather not go into the philosophy of what this means. For men have got mixed up on this question and have wrangled needlessly over it. Still as some stumble at it, we will say a few words on it. First, what Jesus says, what the New Testament declares is that "God was in Christ;" that Christ was "God manifest in the flesh;" that Christ was "the image of God and the brightness of his glory;" that the "Word which was with God and was God became flesh and lived among men." In a true sense God is forever manifesting Himself in all good lives. "But these lives are only single colors; in Jesus

Christ all the colors of the spectrum are woven together into a single perfect ray. In others they are maimed and broken by the human atmosphere through which they are refracted; in him they are as clear as when they first issued from the sun. The noblest human lives speak of God only in divers portions and in divers manners, broken, fragmentary, imperfect; Christ is the perfect Word. That God should become a man is incredible; but "that God should so enter into a human life, and so fill it with his own affluent being that it should become the manifestation of himself to men why should this be deemed incredible?"

Secondly, Jesus Christ manifests not simply the attributes of God, but God Himself. He is not simply a messenger sent from God, but the manifestation of God himself. He is not like the moon, a reflection of the divine Sun; He is that Sun Himself revealing Himself to men through a colored glass of humanity, because only in this way can the human vision behold that Sun. God is in Him, so that, according to His own words, any one that believes in Him thereby believes in God.

Thirdly, Jesus Christ manifests what God is, *i. e.* what He has been from eternity and will be to all eternity; not simply what He was at a period eighteen and a half centuries ago, nor what He has been only since He tabernacled among us in Jesus Christ.

Returning now to our main point, the Christian's God is the God who reveals Himself in all nature, in all human lives, but pre-eminently in Jesus Christ. That is, ask us to describe God and we say He is like Christ. To attempt to describe God is such a hopeless task that one knows he can only imperfectly perform it. Therefore it is well to look at His incarnation. We must move from the better known to the less known. Confessedly it has been hard to get an adequate living knowledge of God. Christ professes to be, and in human experience has been, the best means of knowing God. Therefore it is philosophical to say that God, whom men need to know, is like the Christ whom they do know.

Christianity says that God is like Christ. That is, in order that men may have any distinct conception of God, since it is necessary to attain that conception beginning from a human standpoint and in terms of human experience, the supreme revelation of God to men is Jesus Christ, whom Christianity teaches to be the incarnation of God.

Through Jesus Christ the thoughts, purposes, ways of God are especially revealed. God is like Christ. Is this satisfactory to reason? As an historical fact Christ has taught men concretely to know God as they did not know Him before Jesus Christ came into the world, and He is doing this all the time. What does any one know of God's character which Christ does not better reveal than can be known in any other way? The God whom Christ reveals is the Father of all spirits, in whom all power and wisdom and goodness dwell, whose nature is at once necessarily just and necessarily merciful. Especially is He revealed as the holy Redeemer, who must of necessity abhor all sin, and yet who feels infinite compassion for every sinner; who reveals Himself as the crowning influence to lead men to forsake sin and to love holiness; who must suffer till sin is put away and by suffering restore sinners to righteousness; who by His Holy Spirit is everywhere seeking to restore the divine image in all hearts; and who at the end of this age will again reveal Himself in a way of which at present we are capable of receiving only faint hints. Our reason tells us that it is reasonable that our Heavenly Father, as He progressively makes a more and more full revelation of Himself to His human children, would give a full revelation of Himself *concretely* in and through a man. There is nothing which we know of God which is not best revealed through Christ. In other words, just as reason approves of the Man of Christianity revealed in Jesus Christ, so it bows before the God of Christianity revealed through Jesus Christ. Is not the great, great God, the good, good God whom Christ reveals the God whom our reason and our heart crave? Would it not be blessed to have such a living relation with Him as Christ offers to help us to secure?

The Holy Spirit.

Men needed such a *concrete* revelation of God as was made by Christ in his human relations. With much abstract teaching, and without this concrete revelation man would not have secured much knowledge of God or living acquaintance with him. But the human limitations of Christ constituted a serious obstacle to men's adequately knowing God through him. For God is Spirit. He is always everywhere. So long as Christ

remained in visible form on earth man would unavoidably think that His help was available only when they could see him. Therefore after He had done the work which needed to be done by His incarnation, He said, Now it is expedient for you that I go away. When I go away I will send the Holy Spirit to you. Being only Spirit, and invisible, He will show you spiritual things, He will abide with you forever, and will lead you into all truth. That is, Christianity teaches that the Spirit of God is everywhere working on the hearts of men, trying to make them holy, and that He especially uses the things of Christ, His character, words, deeds, death, resurrection, and His present life, to bring men into living relations and hence into holy relations with the Father. Does not this doctrine easily commend itself to reason? Herbert Spencer says that we are "ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from whom all things proceed." Christianity teaches the same thing, and says that this Infinite and Eternal Energy is the Spirit of God. If God is the Infinite and Eternal Energy, He *must* be *present* everywhere, and must be *active* everywhere. Men can easily believe that God is active everywhere in all the operations of nature. But they do not believe in His spiritual operations on the spirits of men, because they are not themselves spiritual minded. Hence, just as men think and speak of the operations of nature as if they were carried on by some "laws," and do not appreciate that "natural laws" are nothing except God's ordinary ways of doing His work, so they fail to appreciate that many of the common phenomena of their spirits show the constant presence and activity of God.

Much of what is called "conscience" is only the voice of the Holy Spirit. When a wicked man is proposing to do something wrong and is even trying to persuade himself that the proposed act is justifiable, and a voice in his heart says to him, "That is wrong. You should not do it," whose voice is it? It cannot be his own. He is trying to make it easy to do what he wishes to do. If God is everywhere, is ever active, is He not doing something in that wicked man's heart? Is it any other than the voice of the Holy Spirit Himself—though men ordinarily call it conscience—which tells the man he ought not to do the wrong?

This is the universal work of the Holy Spirit. But He has a more especial work. After

the use of an ordinary instrument when a wise man has made himself one still more efficient, He uses this better instrument. Is God less wise? The revelation of God's character and wishes which Christ has made is such an advance on every other revelation that it is now His supreme instrument in leading men to see their sin, to repent of it and to turn to Him in loving trust and obedience. Hence it is most reasonable that the Holy Spirit should especially take the things of Christ and rely on them in His work of making men holy. As a historical fact it was Christ who first told the world plainly about the Holy Spirit, and foretold what His work would be. Having done His work of revealing God and suffering for sin and having risen again, and having also revealed the ideal man, He Himself said, now "it is expedient for you that I go away. * * But if I go, I will send the Paraclete [the Holy Spirit] unto you. * * When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth. * * He shall glorify me, for he shall take of mine and declare it unto you." As a matter of fact that is what the Spirit of God is now doing. While He speaks to all men in what is called conscience, He finds the things of Christ His main reliance in bringing men into holy and living connection with God. A *present* God, who lives *in* us, who inspires us with good thoughts and purposes, who is a perpetual helper and guide and comforter, who is so strong, so wise, so tender, so holy, who makes us realize what Christ did and was and is, and what He is to make of us, this is the Christian's Holy Spirit. As a doctrine this is reasonable to the intellect. As a living experience it is the consummate fact of our life. We trust Him to take even this feeble, but sincere statement about Him, to use it to impress your mind and heart and make you conscious of a personal call to you to let Him lead you into holiness and to give you the inexpressible comfort of a *present* God.

Salvation.

In former articles showing that Christ and His teachings, when simply stated, in the highest degree commend themselves to the human reason as philosophical and true, we have thus far spoken of the Christian doctrine of God. We now consider the relations and work of the Christian's God to man as a

sinner, how God and man are reconciled, and how man is led to see and forsake sin and to live in loving obedience to God.

Salvation—salvation from sin, and securing a holy character both in this world and in the world to come—this is the one great, practical aim of Christianity. What has reason to say about this aim and the way in which Christianity seeks to secure it? So far as we have to consider what have been and what are the workings of God's heart in this matter we have in hand a most profound subject on which we need light from Him. Christ professed to give such light. In a brief statement and from a limited standpoint all aspects of the Christian position cannot be stated. Its essence is that Christ came into the world to show God's feelings in regard to the sinfulness of men and His desire to save them from it; that Christ by His life, sufferings, death, and resurrection has done that which leads men to forsake sin and enables God to forgive their sin, and which is used by the Spirit of God to develop a holy character more and more in them. Is this true, and is it reasonable?

We must first understand who Christ is and what He does. We have before shown that Christ is God's special manifestation of Himself. Men needed to know God as they did not and could not, unless God revealed Himself still more than He had done. It being God's nature to reveal Himself, it was most natural and probable that He would reveal Himself by the method which is best adapted to man's needs, *i. e.* by a visible, perfect indwelling among men. This is the Christian doctrine about the person of Christ; and the doctrine of His work is that He sought and seeks to bring sinful man into harmony with God. In Biblical language the Christian doctrine of atonement is this, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself." The method of His work is largely expressed in the Biblical expression, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." What does this mean, and is it reasonable?

It means that God suffered and suffers for the sins of men, that without such suffering neither could He put away sin and forgive it, nor without it are men enabled to put away sin, and that as a matter of fact through His sufferings God and men are reconciled and

man is brought into harmony with his Maker and Father. To the reasonableness of this doctrine two conflicting objections are offered. One is that it is not possible for God to forgive sin or to remove its evil consequences. The other objection is that God forgives sins without any suffering on His part or any special suffering on man's part, and therefore that the sufferings and death of Christ have no essential part in the reconciling of a holy God and sinful men.

In reply to the first objection we call attention to two undeniable facts. First, though all physical nature and also the Bible unquestionably teach the important and wholesome lesson that "whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap," yet they both also teach the equally important complementary truth that even physical nature is largely *remedial*. "There is a dumb prophet of redemption in nature, whose voice might well prepare us to listen for a voice of pardon in the spiritual realm. The effects of physical sin are not irreparable. On the contrary, the moment the sin ceases, the work of reparation begins. The broken bone, reset, begins to knit together; the cut flesh begins to close up; and where the tissue has been burned away, nature mercifully produces new tissue to take its place. The dyspeptic ceases to violate the laws of health, and the stomach begins to repair the ravages which he has made in it. If nature is unable to repair the wrong, there are reparative agencies in the world outside ready to give their aid in such force and number that it is beginning to be believed that there is no disease which humanity has brought upon itself by its violation of natural law, for which there is not somewhere, stored up in God's pharmacopeia, an instrument of repair." The second undeniable fact in answer to the first objection that sin cannot be forgiven is that, not only in physical nature are the effects of sin sometimes removed, but that *men* actually do forgive one another and put away the sins of others. Cannot the good God do as much as men? Wicked men *have been* made good. Wicked nations *have been* raised and improved.

In reply to the second and contrary objection that God forgives so easily that He can do it without any suffering, and that the sufferings of Christ have no essential connection with the remission of human sin, we fearlessly appeal to the testimony of human nature and of history. Can even a good man see wrong

done by any one, can he suffer wrong against himself from any one, even from his own children, without feeling pain? Is it not indisputable that the more intelligent and holy the man, the more pain he suffers from the sins of others? If he is benevolent and loving as well as upright, will not his wounded love and uprightness lead him to make efforts that cost him much to bring back the offender from his wrong doing? And will the wrong doer feel pain and repentance for his sin if his injured parent or friend takes the whole thing lightly? On the contrary, is not the pain which he gives those whom he respects and who love him, the most potent influence in reforming him? All human experience gives but one answer to these test questions. If this is true of good men in their relations with sinners, must it not be even more so with the holy and good God? Beyond a peradventure God suffers the keenest pain at the sins of men. But men do not appreciate this, and for this reason they keep on sinning regardless of God and of such suggestions as He gives them in attaching physical suffering to wrong doing in the body, and mental and moral degradation to mental and spiritual wrong doing. Would this not make Him suffer still more, and in time would He not reveal this? According to His uniform practice of revealing Himself more and more fully (as we have before shown) when the time came for Him to make that highest revelation of Himself, which as a historical fact He made by His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, was it not unavoidable that He should manifest His intense pain at the sins of His human children? Even if our former arguments did not fully convince you that Jesus Christ is, in a supreme sense, the revelation of God, or is God manifest in the flesh, there is a new proof of this position in the necessity which we are now considering. The holy God, whose nature is to reveal Himself, must somehow show the intense grief which He feels at the sins of His human children and at the indifference to sin which they manifest. Can you, friends, suggest a way more godlike, more fitting, to help men out of sin than the sufferings and death of Jesus Christ? At any rate as a historical fact, have they not been the most efficacious means of teaching men how God grieves over sin and of leading them to grieve over their own sins and to forsake them?

We do not see how any one can question what has been said, but we wish to enlarge on the point that the law of human nature shows how profoundly philosophical is the Christian doctrine of the atonement in its influence in turning men from sin. That law of human nature is, that the great redemptive power over the lives of men is the power of a loving heart suffering for another's sins. In Binghampton, New York, there is an asylum for drunkards. Its superintendent says:—"Some men are sent here under compulsion—almost driven here by their friends; and no such man is ever cured. No man ever has gone from this asylum cured of his inebriety unless there was some one—a sister, a mother, a wife, a maiden—who prayed for him, hoped for him, and wept for him at home." Friends, human nature is the same everywhere. What is there in the physical world, what is there in simply the intentions of our own hearts even when quickened by God, what is there in the life and teachings of any great religious teacher, which shows us how intense is God's pain at our sin, how ready He is to do everything in His power to help us give up our sins and become like Him, comparable with the power of Jesus Christ's character and sufferings? He Himself says that He came to "give his life a ransom for many." While living he foretold the effect of His death in the words, "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men to me." Philosophy shows that the power of His unexampled self-sacrifice for sin is profoundly fitted to help men from sin to holiness. History shows that it has been unparalleled as such a power. Experience is showing that the love of God as revealed in Christ's life and sufferings is to-day "the power of God unto salvation." Now, friends, is not your intellect convinced that it would be good for you to know more of this Christ? Does not your heart tell you that Christ can help you out of sin into loving relations to your heavenly Father? He is near us all. Will you not ask His help?

Retribution.

SALVATION—this is the chief end which Christ seeks to accomplish for sinners. And by salvation He means union with God through likeness to God. Yet He also taught that man is in such a true sense the arbiter of his own destiny that he can resist God's will and all

God's efforts to restore him to union with Himself; and that as long as anyone does this, he deserves and brings on himself the retribution which God has indissolubly linked to sin. In short, the Christian doctrine of retribution involves three points:—God has connected sin with its own retribution of misery; man can remain incorrigible in sin; those who endlessly remain incorrigible will suffer endless retribution. Are these points reasonable?

Has not God connected sin with its own retribution of misery? Did not the poet, Bryant, speak the truth when he wrote:—

“God hath yoked to guilt
Her pale tormentor, misery.”

What is more the teaching of all natural science to-day than the intimate and immediate connection of cause and effect. There is no arbitrariness in the working of any divine laws, physical or moral. Do not drunkenness and licentiousness and dirt and carelessness bring their own righteous retribution to the body of every man? Do not mental laziness and the pretence of knowing something which one does not know and allowing a bias to control the judgment bring their own retribution to the mind of every man? Do not untruth, pride, selfishness, impure imaginations, bitterness inevitably bring their own retribution to the soul of every man? The man is blind who does not recognize this.

Can man remain incorrigible in sin? The simple, sad fact is that multitudes keep on sinning more and more from childhood to old age and death, and leave this world with their faces in the direction of more sin. Moreover, men do this in spite of the strenuous exertions of God to dissuade them from sin. Every physical, mental, and spiritual suffering which is linked to sin is an effort by God to draw men away from wrong-doing. Every suggestion of conscience is God's voice of warning and entreaty. Every good example among men, every helpful tie of friend and relative—such as that of a godly parent, wife, child and associate—is God's loving-hand drawing men from sin to holiness. The teachings, example and ever-living influence of Christ on those who know about Him are God's revelation of His inmost heart pleading with men to forsake sin. Nevertheless, the sad, sad fact remains that some men resist all these divine influences and go deeper and deeper into sin. There is no more solemn truth than the

awful power of the human soul to reject all love, even the love of the Almighty God.

Moreover, all human nature, all experience, and all the teachings of Christ, show that God influences and entreats, but He never compels or coerces. By its nature love cannot be coerced. The terrible assumption of man's power to resist all gracious influences underlies all Christ's life and teaching. “Hence His arguments, entreaties, persuasions; His incarnation, His tears, His nights of prayer, His Gethsemane agony, His breaking heart, His tragic death, * * * His resurrection, His perpetual intercession, His ever-living presence with His Church.” One could hope that almighty love had resources which could eventually avail to draw every sinner back to God. But calm reason sees no assurance for the hope. Habit is the strongest law of human nature. When a man has persistently resisted all such warnings, persuasions and loving entreaties of God as have been described above, with his habits hardened into a confirmed character, the scientific law of continuity gives reason only to infer that the man will persist in his present spirit. Whatever God can do, He will do. It is not lapse of time, but persistence in evil which controls Him. Every consideration of reason, then, indicates that man can remain incorrigible in sin despite God's best love.

Granting that God has connected sin with its own retribution of misery, and that man can remain incorrigible in sin, it logically follows as a conclusion that those who endlessly remain incorrigible will suffer endless retribution. What the nature of endless rewards will be, what the nature of endless misery, Christ does not plainly indicate. But a few times He uses the solemn fact that there are to be such endless results of holiness and sin to warn and encourage men. At present philosophy and Biblical research are earnestly engaged with a study into the conditions and nature of these eternal results. But no great thinker questions the certainty, the wisdom, or the benevolence of the controlling law of God which underlies this whole subject; that guilt brings misery. It is not future punishment, but present sin from which Christ seeks to save us. And men who are not afraid of pride and selfishness and impurity and all neglect of God to-day will not be deterred from it by fancying that God does not rule now and postpones righteous retribution to a vague future. Like God's law of gravitation which knows no limitations of time or place,

His law of righteous retribution is always here and always now in operation. "Like the spark and the sting of an electric shock, sin and retribution are one." Whether in the highest heaven or in the lowest hell, every soul receives payments by the law which is expressed in Biblical language thus: "To them who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and immortality [there is] eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, [there is] indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil." Is not this reasonable? Is it not solemnly true?

Miracles.

In our first article on the present subject we made the important preliminary remark that Christianity has a threefold aspect; it is a life, a history, and a philosophy. Primarily and chiefly it is a life—a true life of Jesus Christ in the soul. To one who has such a true and living connection with Him there is as little difficulty to his reason about the truth of Christ as there is to the reason of a child in accepting continual help from his parent, or to the reason of any man in delightful intercourse with a friend. Still to a thoughtful child and friend, at some time an explanation of the nature and character of his parent and friend and of their relations to him is a great help. It enables him to appreciate them better; it enlarges his own soul and makes him a nobler person. So an understanding of the philosophy of Christianity helps our apprehension of Christianity as a life.

Viewing Christianity as a history, *i. e.* the belief that certain events connected with Christ occurred at certain times, the main application of reason is in weighing the credibility of the evidences for the alleged facts. Viewing Christianity as a philosophy, *i. e.* as an interpretation of man and nature in their relations to God, there is a wide sweep for the exercise of reason. This is the field which we have traversed thus far in this paper. To our reason the Christian conception of man, of God, of what God has done and is doing to reveal Himself to His human children, of what He has done and is doing to win man from sin into loving and holy relations with Himself, and of his wise law of retribution, seems profoundly philosophical. We

hope that our consideration of these subjects has helped others in their apprehension of the philosophical truth of Christ and His teaching. We propose now to take up one or two aspects of Christianity as a history. Yet as a preliminary we shall first consider one subject which is essentially philosophical.

Like all historical truth, the truth of Christianity depends on the trustworthiness of the testimony for it. That testimony has been subjected for centuries to every kind of test, and on account of its having been submitted to these crucial tests, a large part of the human race believes the truth of the alleged facts of Christianity. However, with a certain class of minds one aspect of these alleged facts has caused and still causes an attitude of doubt or of open disbelief. That aspect is the miraculous character of some alleged facts. One chief reason for this difficulty has been an incorrect apprehension, by both friends and doubters, of what are termed "natural laws" and "miracles." It has not been sufficiently borne in mind that a law implies a law-giver, and that no law, regarded simply as an expression of will or as a command, executes itself. As often as it is executed it has to be enforced by a person. Similarly what are termed "natural laws" are not impersonal forces, but simply God's uniform and ordinary method of conducting affairs.

But no wise man or ruler who ordinarily works in one way, feels hindered thereby from sometimes varying his procedure or from using unusual forces or methods. Nor would he deem an occasionally unusual course as implying any reflection on his ordinary habit. All that he does is by a use or by a combination of some of his many resources to produce a result at a given time which he does not care ordinarily to effect. Why is it not reasonable to believe that God would do the same thing? What we understand the alleged miracles of Christianity to be is nothing else than some unusual acts of God. Such miracles were no "violation of natural laws," as even Christians have sometimes supposed. They were no results of after-thought. They never caused in the minds of those who saw them, or of those who now read of them, any question of the excellence of God's ordinary mode of working as shown in what we call "natural laws." They were simply unusual acts revealing His character in a way to draw His children nearer to him, and some-

times suggesting possibilities and truths of which men knew little or nothing, but which it would be helpful to know.

Physical science gives analogies of what we are saying. When a man lifts his foot, the natural law of gravitation pulls on his foot and tends to keep it in contact with the ground just as uniformly as when he does not lift it. But, being a free agent, by the exercise of his will he can bring another force into use and effect a result different from what would be if only the law of gravitation were at work on his foot. Moreover, in connection with physical science men are gradually discovering subtler and more powerful forces, *i. e.* modes of God's working, than they formerly knew. This revelation of the power and wisdom of God causes no diminution of respect for Him and for such modes of His operation as we formerly knew. On the contrary they increase our reverence for Him.

Now the alleged miracles of Christianity, if true, are simply unusual acts of God. All that a fair man needs to do is to consider the evidence for the alleged facts. In physical science it has been positively affirmed *a priori* that certain things were impossible, which afterwards proved to be true. All that true science teaches us to do is to weigh with an unbiassed mind the testimony for every alleged fact. If it seems absolutely inconsistent with accepted principles, we are rightly more slow to believe and require stronger proofs. And yet the scientific way is to examine the proofs. Applying these principles to the alleged miracles of Christ, we admit that it is not wrong to ask for the best of proof. Therefore we shall take one chief miracle, *viz.* the alleged resurrection of Christ. The improbability that an ordinary man had arisen from the dead is so great that almost any amount of testimony would hardly convince men of the truth of such an alleged event. But Christ was not a common man. And we shall ask our readers now to consider how the character of Christ, the needs of man, the results of Christ's life, and several unquestionable facts of human history give much added credibility to the remarkable testimony to the resurrection of Christ. We hope this will lead them to see that it is highly reasonable to accept its truth and to act upon it.

The Resurrection of Christ.

No one doubts that Jesus Christ lived in Palestine nearly nineteen centuries ago, that He was put to death by the Romans, and that He was buried. Did He rise from that tomb on the third day? This must be decided by the evidence. Still some very weighty considerations make it much more credible *a priori* that Jesus Christ should rise from the dead than that another person should do so. We mention some of these.

1. We have previously sought to show that Jesus Christ is a peculiar revelation, is the supreme revelation of God to men, is God manifest in the flesh. As a matter of fact He gave a revelation of God such as men did not have before and such as has not been equalled since. Moreover, He gave such a revelation of the future relations of God and man as men had not had, and such as has ever since most powerfully affected the world.

(1) From very ancient times, as we see for example, from some Egyptian practices and doctrines and from the Hindu doctrine of the transmigration of souls, some men have had some conjecture about the continued existence of the soul of men after the separation of the soul and body by death. Some philosophers, like Plato, have philosophized on this subject. Yet how vague and unsatisfactory it all was. Now is it not highly probable that God, whose nature it is more and more to reveal Himself, would sometime give men more light on this important subject? And Christ being the supreme revelation of God, does it not just fit in with His nature and work to reveal in His own personal history what is to be the future of men after their souls and bodies have been separated? If they are to be raised from the dead, it is important to know this. And there is no way of impressing it on men like an actual historical exhibition of its truth.

(2) Again, it seems antecedently essential to the mental and moral integrity of Christ that He should rise from the dead. Here was a man who for the brief space of only three years, in a somewhat obscure country, went about with a few uninfluential disciples from the humbler ranks of society, Who must have foreseen that which came to Him, *viz.* the hostility of all other religious teachers and finally death at their hands, Who knew that by His death His timid disciples would be terrified

and perplexed, Who never took pains to write anything about Himself, nor to direct His disciples to do so, Who yet spoke in the most confident and lofty tones of what these timid disciples were to do afterwards, how they should go into all the world and make multitudes of other disciples, and that He should "draw all men" to Himself. How can we explain even the mental integrity of such a being, Whom every thoughtful person knows to have been the wisest man who ever lived, unless we account for it by His certain expectation of some such supreme proof of Himself and His teachings as His resurrection from the dead?

Besides, His moral integrity makes His resurrection a necessity. Later on we shall show another phase of this point. Here we only speak of His teachings before His death. He not only predicted His resurrection in plain words, e. g.,

"The Son of man shall be delivered unto the chief priests, and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles; and they shall mock him, and shall scourge him, and shall spit upon him, and shall kill him; *and the third day he shall rise again;*"

but also in veiled language which no one could have invented He similarly predicted His resurrection thus:—

"As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth."

(3) The resurrection of Christ seems a necessary complement to that which He claimed to be His chief work, viz. the salvation of men. Death, as it now is, is the fruit of sin. A completeness is given to His work only when He shows that God can overcome sin so as to turn even its evil results into blessing and victory, that there is victory over even death, and that God's grace abounds even more than sin. This completeness could be secured only by the resurrection.

(4) To us who are far removed from that time and who cannot ask questions of those who professed to be eye-witnesses of Christ after His resurrection, it is no small consideration that the actual results of belief in that event have been momentous and momentous for good only. Ever since that alleged event there has been in the world a profound conviction of a life of the soul after death, multitudes

of sorrowing hearts have been comforted by the hope of meeting departed friends in another world, those who have suffered trial and wrong have been sustained by the hope of rewards hereafter, and those who have been tempted to do wrong have often been restrained by the anticipation of certain retribution beyond the grave.

Such preliminary considerations prepare us for taking up the remarkably convincing evidence for the resurrection of Christ.

2. (1) The first unquestionable fact is that the tomb in which Christ was buried was empty on the third day. Even enemies concede this. If that tomb had not somehow become empty, there would have been no possibility for the report that Christ had risen. Or, if it had been started, the Jews and Romans could immediately have stopped it by saying "Look in the tomb: there is his body now." It is only wonderful that the Jews did not put another corpse into the tomb to stop the report.

(2) Though the Jews and the soldiers who were guarding the tomb started the report that Christ's disciples had stolen his body, the impossibility of this explanation is seen (a) from the fact that what the disciples wanted to do was to run away and hide from persecution. They had neither thought nor courage to oppose the Jews and Romans in what they were doing. (b) They could not have stolen the body from the Roman soldiers, if they had wished to do so. (c) The dead body of Christ would have been only a terror to them.

(3) The disciples who had fled from Christ when He was arrested, and had denied that they knew Him, and had been terrified lest they also should be seized and punished, from the third day on manifested an entire revolution of character. Instead of being timid, they were now most bold, testifying before the multitudes and before the authorities that they had seen Christ after His resurrection, even though punished and persecuted for saying so. Timid men are not made so bold by an imagination.

(4) The mental and moral condition of the disciples was not one of credulity and hope. On the contrary some of them disbelieved even the testimony of their associates who claimed to have seen the risen Christ, and it was only after incontrovertible evidence that they believed.

(5) At intervals during forty days, in dif-

ferent places, under different circumstances, to single persons, to companies of two, ten, and once of five hundred, there appeared One whom they all accepted as their risen Lord.

(6) The contemporaries of these Christians so believed these witnesses that multitudes who were enemies became Christians.

(7) This event so affected the disciples that very soon after the event they began to observe Sunday, the day on which Christ rose, as their weekly day of worship and gladness in place of Saturday the day which the Jews had always observed and still observe. It is not reasonable to believe that such an important institution as the Christian Sabbath is founded on a fancy.

(8) We have unquestionable written accounts showing the universal belief of the early church in this event, composed within twenty-five years of Christ's death. The letters of Paul to the Churches at Thessalonica and Corinth and Rome and in Galatia are acknowledged by all good scholars to have been written within twenty-five years of that event, and they give indirect and direct proof of the very general belief in Christ's resurrection.

3. Other explanations have been attempted of this singular event. In the light of calm and impartial examination it is seen that they all are far less credible than the simple, natural one that He rose from the dead.

(1) It has been suggested that the disciples stole the body of Christ and told the lie that He had risen. But (a) they would not have dared to try to steal Christ's body: (b) they could not have done it: (c) the *dead* body would not have given them the courage which they showed, but would have increased their fears: (d) it would not have appeared in different places to different persons: (e) everyone knows that the disciples were not imposters and liars.

(2) It has been imagined that Jesus did not die, but swooned on the cross, and after being put into the tomb came to consciousness, somehow got out, and that the people believed this to be a resurrection from the dead. His prediction that He would be put to death, the testimony of the soldiers who conducted the crucifixion and other matters discredit this theory. But the one overwhelming disproof is that if Jesus had not died and risen, but only revived from a swoon, He

would never have let men believe such a lie about Himself.

(3) It has been imagined that the eager expectancy of the disciples that their Lord would rise from the dead created out of their hopes an hallucination that the Lord had risen. But (a) the disciples had no such eager expectancy: and (b) even if they had had it, no hallucination would have been enough to give them the courage which they showed, nor would it have converted enemies into friends.

(4) It has been suggested that little by little, as the years and generations rolled by, the spiritual confidence of the more elevated Christians dwelt on the immortal influence of their Master, which in grosser minds grew into a belief in His material resurrection. But, (a) this implies that the tomb was never empty, which must have been the case: (b) the belief grew up *immediately*, and not after years and generations: (c) this cannot account for the courage of the disciples, the spread of Christianity, the early keeping of Sunday and many other undeniable facts. These are the only alternatives to the belief in the reality of the resurrection. Not one of them is a living opinion to-day. "The faith in the reality of the resurrection has won its victory through centuries of battle, over active opposition or inert doubt. It won the belief of the disciples, in spite of their settled and hopeless despair. It won the assent of Greek and Roman, in spite of a sneering materialistic infidelity more callous than any skepticism of modern times. It created a church; gave to the world a new day of rest; inspired humanity with a new worship; changed the very features of its civilization." It is most reasonable to believe in this event and in the Christ who rose and now lives to help every man.

Evolution.

One of the chief causes why there is a more or less vague impression in many minds that Christianity cannot bear the most searching tests of reason is the assumption that it is at variance with the ascertained facts and the probable hypotheses of natural science. It must be confessed that much of this mistaken impression is due to Christians who have too hastily condemned new scientific theories as anti-Christian. Still it is also partly due to some scientists who have presented new theo-

ries which contained much that was valuable, in implied or openly expressed connection with a philosophy that is really anti-Christian.

Latterly this assumed hostility between science and Christianity, or more strictly between science and theism, has mainly had reference to the doctrine of evolution. But the history of human thought shows that this is only a repetition of an old, old experience. When modern astronomy was not fully demonstrated nor generally accepted, it was hotly contested that there was utter incompatibility between it and Christianity. The same was the case with modern chemistry and geology. But eventually it was easily seen, not only that there is no incompatibility between any of these sciences and Christian truth, but that they confirm the latter and amplify its application. Already it is proving the same with all in the doctrine of evolution that is established and that is essential to it.

The doctrine of evolution is an old doctrine. From the time of Lucretius it has been represented as a doctrine of necessity and apart from the action of God. When Darwin revived the doctrine, he treated the subject entirely apart from the action of God. Hence Christians and theists naturally looked on evolution as anti-theistic. But such scientists as Mivart, the Duke of Argyll and Professor Asa Gray, and such philosophers as McCosh have shown that it is not a question of creation versus evolution, but of *creation by evolution or without evolution*, and when the anti-theistic bias was seen to be no part of evolution, the whole subject was greatly cleared. At the present time some doctrine of evolution is accepted by the best Christian scientists and philosophers. And like all truth it is seen to honour God and, in certain respects, to confirm the Christian system.

The principle by which there will come a solution of the apparent conflict between evolution and Christian theism has been well generalized thus "The main fact in evolution is force working uniformly; but evolution does not explain force; it receives it from some will, which is its only possible origin. But will is an attribute of personality, and is the basis and a large part of religion. We have, therefore, in religion an original factor which is found in the process of evolution,—not as an essential element, but simply as a method of operation. Reli-

gion, therefore, is not compassed by the evolutionary process and laws, but is directly related to the eternal will that imparts its force to the process of evolution. In other words, religion is not correlated to a method of force, but to force itself, that is to the eternal will. Religion, therefore stands in freedom, for will is free." In other words, force is not a self-acting entity, but the *method* of the action of an intelligent cause.

When the doctrine of creative evolution is explained as meaning the orderly creation by law, *i. e.* by the uniform action of God, who is immanent in the universe, and who develops everything from simple primary forms to the most complex organisms, by the adjustment of what are called natural forces, there is no antitheistic tendency in the doctrine. It is not necessary now to give evidences in support of evolution. It is enough to say that it finds support in astronomy, chemistry, geology and biology, and that it now meets little opposition. Most thoughtful men accept it as the true explanation of the universe up to man. Some extend its operations to the physical, but not to the intellectual and moral, elements of man. Others make it embrace all. But the doctrine of creation of the entire man by evolution no more contradicts the Christian system than creation of the lower orders by evolution. It adds to the unity of the universe to accept one method of God's action in all its parts. It fits in with the unity of action of an all-wise God to accept one key that turns all wards of His universe, past, present and future.

The doctrine of evolution not only perfects our conception of the unity of God, but it strengthens the argument from design by which His goodness is proved. Evolution affirms and shows that in all the upward movement in the universe from the first particles up to man there has been design and one controlling purpose. Here is design on the grandest scale. Moreover it obviates all the difficulties which formerly met the argument from design in imperfect and crude forms. It was difficult to reconcile with a noble conception of God the creation of long orders of creatures of uncouth forms who simply devoured one another, till the evolutionary philosophy taught that they all were transient, but necessary forms "in an ever growing process, yielding to more shapely and complex orders, and so climbing by an

* See Dr. T. T. Munger's, *The Appeal to Life*.

ever finer transition to some final and perfect end."

Moreover, evolution properly considered, brings God nearer to us than any previous theories of creation. Every operation of all nature is thus represented as an act of the God who is immanent in all His works, and who is thus ever revealing Himself. The Miltonic conception of creation by one original fiat put God at the beginning, and then represented the universe as going on like a machine, having little connection with God except His preserving the machine. The evolutionary philosopher with sympathetic insight into nature recognizes the truth of Tennyson's line,

"Closer is he than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

As the evolutionary philosophy is better understood men see that it is no discredit to men that, as our bodies bear some organic relation to the lower forms of life, so our mental and moral qualities have their first intimations in the brute world. Moral qualities are not found in brutes, but the grounds of these qualities are there. Their presence there is a prophecy of the future, showing the divine purpose to develop moral beings at the right time. Again, just as botany shows that though a flower is evolved from a leaf, it becomes a flower only by ceasing to be a leaf, so, though moral qualities are evolved from brute qualities, they become moral only by ceasing to be what they were. In other words, they get their essential nature not from their connection with lower forms or with the process, but from the divine mind which is behind and in the process. "It may be set down as an axiom that the *end of a process cannot be identified with the process.*"

Some Christians have felt especial difficulty about evolution because this seemed incompatible with the Biblical account of the introduction of sin into the world. But evolution does not question that man is a moral being having freedom, consciousness, moral sense and personality. It only says that God made him such by slow development from lower forms. Even if the evolutionary hypothesis should be established, that in *all* respects man is developed from the lower forms of creation, on that very hypothesis there is no scientific reason against the theory that when man became a free agent crowned with moral

sovereignty, his past brutish connection pulled him down. "As in creation the chemic needed more of God to become the organic, and as the organic needed more of God than could be found in the chemic in order to become vital and conscious, so man may need God in all his fulness and in the perfection of his manifestation in order to become perfectly man. Hence a revelation: hence the incarnation. If the whole progressive creation is a progressive revelation of God, when its process culminates and ends in man, it is the very thing we might expect; namely, that there should be a full and perfect manifestation of God in the form and with the powers needed to lift humanity up to the level of its destiny:" *i. e.* the evolutionary philosophy itself looks forward to an incarnation like Jesus Christ. Hence the latest phase of science, like all the previous sciences of astronomy, chemistry and geology, adds its indirect and its direct testimony to the reasonableness and truth of Christ; and Christ is Christianity.

Conclusion.

We hope that our readers have been helped to see that there are the strongest reasons for believing that Christianity is true as a history and true as a philosophy. If so, it is sure to be true as a life. If true as life, it is of the utmost practical importance, for it is nothing less than Christ Himself, the ever-living Christ, coming into the most helpful relations with our lives, revealing God to us, giving us His thoughts, beliefs, loves and so making us like Himself—in part in this world and more fully in the world to come. This result is so important that, even if any one is not fully convinced in regard to Christianity as history and philosophy, yet their reasonableness is at least so great that it is prudent and desirable to *try* the alleged helpfulness of Christianity, *i. e.*, to act as if Christ were truly alive and seeking to have helpful relations with our souls. That is, a man would do well to say, "In order to know experimentally whether Christ is such a living power as I need, I will give Him a trial. I will try to understand what His directions are, and will follow them as well as I can, and will ask His help in it all." Friends, if you will do this honestly for a little while, our word for it you will know the truth of Christianity, *i. e.* of

Christ, as a life. And when you have this vital testimony, you will also better understand Christianity as a philosophy. This is the way in which Christianity has made its disciples from the first. This is the way in which Christ wishes you to test Him

now. His words are, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. And this is life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent."

